

## STEPTOE &amp; JOHNSON LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
 FACSIMILE: 602.257.5299  
 VERIFICATION: 602.257.5287

1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-1795  
 MAIN NUMBER: 202.429.3000  
 www.stephoe.com

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA  
 FACSIMILE 213.439.9599  
 VERIFICATION: 213.439.9400

RECEIVED

MAR 09 2001

Technology Center 2100

**IMPORTANT:** This facsimile is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmission to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this transmission or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephoning and return the original transmission to us at the above address.

## DELIVER TO:

NAME: <b>Examiner R.F. Sulpizio</b>	TELECOPY PHONE NUMBER: <b>703-308-5065</b>
COMPANY: <b>U.S. Patent and Trademark Office</b>	VERIFICATION NUMBER: <b>703-305-9700</b>
TOTAL PAGES & COVER SHEET: <b>3</b>	
DATE TRANSMITTED:	
S&J OPERATOR'S NAME:	
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	
CLIENT/CASE NUMBER: <b>11953.0002</b>	

## FROM:

NAME: **Scott D. Watkins**

REQUEST MADE ON	DATE: <b>3/5/01</b>	TIME: <b>11:47 AM</b>
COMPLETION REQUIRED BY	DATE: <b>3/5/01</b>	TIME: <b>ASAP</b>

## SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

3-6-01  
 2141

RECEIVED  
 MAR -8 2001  
 100 MAILROOM

## STEPTOE &amp; JOHNSON LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Scott D. Watkins  
202.429.6429  
swatkins@steptoe.com

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1795

Telephone 202.429.3000  
Facsimile 202.429.3902  
www.steptoe.com

#9  
KWS  
3-21-01

March 1, 2001

VIA FACSIMILE

Examiner R. F. Sulpizio  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, DC 20231

Re: **U.S. Appln. No. 09/321,839**  
**INFORMATION SECURITY ARCHITECTURE FOR**  
**ENCRYPTING DOCUMENTS FOR REMOTE ACCESS**  
**WHILE MAINTAINING ACCESS CONTROL ("PAGE VAULT")**  
Our Ref: 11953.0002

Dear Examiner Sulpizio:

Further to our discussion of February 28, 2000, herein follows a summary of the issues that we would like to discuss at the personal interview scheduled for March 6, 2001.

I. Claim 3

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Erickson and Saito or Akiyama et al. Although Akiyama has been added as a new reference against claim 3 from the previous Office Action, the substance of the rejection is nonetheless the same.

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner noted that the recitation of destroying a first key as a "precondition" to receiving the second key did not positively recite this limitation in a manner that would overcome Saito. Applicants subsequently amended claim 3 to recite that the second key is received after destruction of the first key. Although this amendment is believed to positively recite the limitation from the original form of claim 3, the Examiner is of the position that this fails to distinguish over the prior art. Applicants would like to discuss various alternative recitations of the concept that both positively recite the limitation and overcome the cited references.

II. Claims 1, 4, and 10

Claims 1, 4, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 132 for the recitation of "in response to." The Examiner has cited portions of the specification that disclose steps performed by the viewing tool. A clear reading of the cited text shows that these steps are sequential and part of the proper operation of the system. It is therefore not clear to Applicants

Examiner Sulpizio  
March 1, 2001  
Page 2

why the Examiner is of the opinion that these cited sections do not support the claimed "in response to," such that Applicants request clarification on this point.

These same claims have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Erickson and Saito or Akiyama et al. The Examiner is of the position that Akiyama inherently teaches destruction of the decrypted segment in response to the displaying. Applicants have reviewed Akiyama for such teachings, but can find nothing that supports a legal conclusion of inherency. Applicants therefore request clarification on this point.

The undersigned looks forward to discussing the above at the scheduled interview. In the meantime, if there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the above-listed number.

Sincerely,



Scott D. Watkins

SDW:kp